



Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/169,127	12/20/93	SHINOHARA	H 0756945

A1M1/1122  
SIXBEY, FRIEDMAN, LEEDOM & FERGUSON  
2010 CORPORATE RIDGE, STE. 600  
MCLEAN, VA 22102

PADGETT EXAMINER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1112	20

DATE MAILED:

11/22/95

*Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application*

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

## ADVISORY ACTION

 THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a)  is extended to run 5 month or continues to run \_\_\_\_\_ from the date of the final rejection  
b)  expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

 Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 11/17/95 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1.  The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:

- a.  There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.  
b.  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).  
c.  They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).  
d.  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.  
e.  They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

- NOTE: *The amended relationship of the beam shape, especially how one dimension is changed with respect to another is a new issue, as the claim did not previously require or clearly state any such limitations. Further search is required because the claim previously appeared to be requiring the beam be U-shaped, which is now a claimed shape, was accordingly what was looked for in the search!*
2.  Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
3.  Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment  will be entered  will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims rejected: 1-16

However:

- Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): *the amendment is supported in the parent document 61-239,253 filed on 7/26/86, as per p.4 of the certified translation, hence getting past date of art used in the rejection, as the statement not reading in the document being used, the affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because while Yamazaki et al (358) would be removed by virtue of date by 358 reads the (512) and (855) some of his are still good, as are references such as Hongo et al and Krimmel et al, each that 5.  The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented. rejections would be required, in response to entry of this amendment.*

The proposed drawing correction  has  has not been approved by the examiner.

Other

MARIANNE PADGETT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1100